

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application. Claims 1-23 are pending in the present application. Claims 8, 9, 10, 13, 16, 18, 19, and 23 have been amended for further clarification. Claim 17 has been cancelled. No new matter has been entered. In light of the arguments presented below, Applicants believe that pending Claims 1-16 and 18-23 are patentable and should be allowed.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 103

Claims 1 through 12 were rejected under 35 USC section 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,098,066 to Snow et al. (hereinafter “Snow”) in view of U.S. Patent App. No. 2001/0049677 A1 to Talib et al (hereinafter “Talib”). Applicants respectfully submit that Snow and Talib, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious the present invention as claimed.

Independent Claims 1 and 6 recite a method and/or a system for searching a database comprising, *inter alia*, “performing a correlation between the selection information and information from the structure database representing the sub-category structure in a subset of the records, which subset may contain all of the records, to produce a relevance value for a record, and, as a response to the query, selecting information from records in the content database based upon the relevance value of the records.” (Emphasis added).

Looking at the cited reference, Snow discloses a method and apparatus for performing a partitioned search within a document directory hierarchy having classified documents. Snow fails to teach or suggest a method and/or a system for searching a database

comprising, *inter alia*, “performing a correlation between the selection information and information from the structure database representing the sub-category structure in a subset of the records, which subset may contain all of the records, to produce a relevance value for a record, and, as a response to the query, selecting information from records in the content database based upon the relevance value of the records,” as claimed in independent Claims 1 and 6, respectively.

Talib does not remedy any of the deficiencies of Snow. Talib discloses systems and methods for quick and efficient retrieval of information from document archives. Talib is only cited for the recitation of a record parsed into a plurality of categories containing multiple fields of information. However, Talib fails to teach or suggest a method and/or a system for searching a database comprising, *inter alia*, “performing a correlation between the selection information and information from the structure database representing the sub-category structure in a subset of the records, which subset may contain all of the records, to produce a relevance value for a record, and, as a response to the query, selecting information from records in the content database based upon the relevance value of the records,” as claimed in independent Claims 1 and 6, respectively.

Furthermore, Snow fails to teach or suggest a combination with Talib, and Talib fails to teach or suggest a combination with Snow. In any event, even if assuming *arguendo* that a combination may be possible, the combination still fails to teach or suggest a method and/or a system for searching a database comprising, *inter alia*, “performing a correlation between the selection information and information from the structure database representing the sub-category structure in a subset of the records, which subset may contain all of the records, to produce a relevance value for a record, and, as a response to the query, selecting

information from records in the content database based upon the relevance value of the records,” as claimed in independent Claims 1 and 6, respectively.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1 and 6 are distinguishable over Snow and Talib, taken alone or in combination, and should be allowed. Claims 2-5 and 7-12, dependent directly or indirectly from Claims 1 and 6, respectively, are also distinguishable over Snow and Talib, taken alone or in combination, and should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above. In conclusion, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of Claims 1-12.

Claims 13 through 16 were rejected under 35 USC section 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,275,811 to Ginn et al. (hereinafter “Ginn”) in view of PCT Patent Application WO01/61601 A1 to Knepfle et al (hereinafter “Knepfle”). Applicants respectfully submit that Ginn and Knepfle, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious the present invention as claimed. Claims 17 through 23 were rejected under 35 USC section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginn in view of Knepfle, in view of Snow, and further in view of Talib. Applicants respectfully submit that Ginn, Knepfle, Snow and Talib, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious the present invention as claimed.

Claims 13, 16, 18, 19, and 23 have been amended for further clarification. Claim 17 has been cancelled. Independent Claim 13, as amended, recites a system for searching a database comprising, *inter alia*, “a correlation device set performing a correlation between the selection information and information from the structure database representing the sub-category structure in a subset of the records, which subset may contain all of the records, to produce a relevance value for a record, and a unit responding to the query by selecting and

providing information from records in the content database based upon the relevance value of the records.” (Emphasis added).

As discussed in detail above, Snow and Talib, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a system for searching a database comprising, *inter alia*, “a correlation device set performing a correlation between the selection information and information from the structure database representing the sub-category structure in a subset of the records, which subset may contain all of the records, to produce a relevance value for a record, and a unit responding to the query by selecting and providing information from records in the content database based upon the relevance value of the records,” as claimed in independent Claim 13, as amended.

Ginn and Knepfle, taken alone or in combination, do not remedy any of the deficiencies of Snow and Talib.

Ginn is cited only for the teaching of an online forum of the type permitting communication among a plurality of users and also permitting users to post information content for access by users, the improvement comprising a reputation module storing a reputation rating for a user in association with information content. Ginn fails to teach or suggest a system for searching a database comprising, *inter alia*, “a correlation device set performing a correlation between the selection information and information from the structure database representing the sub-category structure in a subset of the records, which subset may contain all of the records, to produce a relevance value for a record, and a unit responding to the query by selecting and providing information from records in the content database based upon the relevance value of the records,” as claimed in independent Claim 13, as amended.

Knepfle is cited only for the teaching of a user's reputation being a function of the degree of his participation in the forum. Knepfle fails to teach or suggest a system for searching a database comprising, *inter alia*, "a correlation device set performing a correlation between the selection information and information from the structure database representing the sub-category structure in a subset of the records, which subset may contain all of the records, to produce a relevance value for a record, and a unit responding to the query by selecting and providing information from records in the content database based upon the relevance value of the records," as claimed in independent Claim 13, as amended.

Furthermore, Ginn and Knepfle, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a combination with Snow and Talib, and Snow and Talib, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a combination with Ginn and Knepfle. In any event, even if assuming *arguendo* that a combination may be possible, the combination still fails to teach or suggest a system for searching a database comprising, *inter alia*, "a correlation device set performing a correlation between the selection information and information from the structure database representing the sub-category structure in a subset of the records, which subset may contain all of the records, to produce a relevance value for a record, and a unit responding to the query by selecting and providing information from records in the content database based upon the relevance value of the records," as claimed in independent Claim 13, as amended.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 13 is distinguishable over Ginn, Knepfle, Snow and Talib, taken alone or in combination, and should be allowed. Claims 14-16 and 18-23, dependent directly or indirectly from Claim 13, as amended, are also distinguishable over Ginn, Knepfle, Snow and Talib, taken alone or in combination, and should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above. In conclusion,

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of Claims 13-16 and 18-23.


In the unlikely event that the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicants petition for any required relief including an extension of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. **50-1128** referencing TRAN.P0001.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims, namely claims 1-16 and 18-23 are patentable and are in condition for allowance. Such allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

STATTLER JOHANSEN & ADELI LLP



Florin Corie  
Reg. No. 46,244

Dated: April 06, 2007

Stattler Johansen & Adeli LLP  
60 South Market Street, Suite 480  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Phone: (408) 881-0140 ext.110  
Fax: (408) 881-0145